

REMARKS

Claims 1, 8-14, 17-18, 23-27, 30-32, 39-42, 45-46, 51-55, 58-60, 67-70, 73-74, 79-83 and 86-139 are pending, with claims 1, 32, 60, 88, 105 and 120 being independent.

Claims 1, 8-14, 23-27, 30-32, 39-42, 51-55, 58-60, 67-70, 79-83, 86 and 87

Claims 1, 8-14, 23-27, 30-32, 39-42, 51-55, 58-60, 67-70, 79-83, 86 and 87 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnan (6,075,863) in view of Onosaka (5,961,608) and Perlman (6,023,585)

Independent claims 1, 32, and 60 recite a system (claim 1), a method (claim 32) and a computer program (claim 60) for installing computer software components on a client device for enabling connectivity to a host system by at least one of several different hardware devices that include, among other features, "detecting whether installation of the connectivity component is needed to enable connectivity between the client device and the host system using a selected hardware device."

Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Krishnan, Onosaka, and Perlman, either alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest these features. Specifically, Krishnan, Onosaka, and Perlman do not describe or suggest detecting whether installation of the connectivity component is needed to enable connectivity between the client device and the host system using a selected hardware device.

Krishnan describes detecting whether devices communicating over an existing connection need an updated version of software, as opposed to detecting whether software is necessary to enable a connection between these devices. As noted at page 3 of the Final Office Action, Krishnan describes synchronizing applet versions between two connected modems. If the modems contain the same applet version, then a data transfer occurs. If the modems do not contain the same applet version, then the modems may negotiate to transfer the new applet version among the modems:

"At steps 40 and 42, modem 10 determines if the applet on the remote modem is the same version as the applet used by modem 10, and if not, which modem has the newer version. If the versions are the same,

then the negotiation is completed and processing continues at step 52. However, if the remote modem has a newer version of the applet, then at step 48 modem 10 downloads the newer applet from the remote modem, and verifies the applet at step 50." See Krishnan, col. 4, line 29-37.

Nowhere does this relied upon section of Krishnan, nor any other part of Krishnan, describe or suggest detecting whether installation of the connectivity component is needed to enable connectivity between the client device and the host system using a selected hardware device. In Krishnan, the connectivity between the client and the host system is already established. As seen from the quote above, the transfer of a new applet version must occur between two modems over an existing, pre-established connection. Thus, in Krishnan, the installation of the new applet does not actually enable connectivity between the client device and the host system using a selected hardware device, but merely improves connection performance by providing the client with a newer/better version of the software. See Krishnan, col. 5, line 33-41.

Onosaka and Perlman do not remedy this failure of Krishnan and, notably, are not relied upon by the Final Office Action to describe or suggest these features that are not present in Krishnan.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 32, and 60, and their respective dependent claims.

Claims 88-91, 93-94, 97, 99-108, 110-111, 114, 116-123, 125-126, 129 and 131-136

Claims 88-91, 93-94, 97, 99-108, 110-111, 114, 116-123, 125-126, 129 and 131-136 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnan (6,075,863) in view of Onosaka (5,961,608) and Elg (6,694,354).

Claims 88, 105, and 120 recite a system (claim 88), a method (claim 105), and a computer program (claim 120) for enabling connectivity to a host system by at least one of several different hardware devices that includes, among other features, detecting whether installation of the connectivity component is needed to enable connectivity between the client device and the host system using a selected hardware device.

For the same reasons as were recited above for claims 1, 32, and 60, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Krishnan, Onosaka, and Elg, either alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest these features. Specifically, Krishnan, Onosaka, and Elg do not describe or suggest detecting whether installation of the connectivity component is needed to enable connectivity between the client device and the host system using a selected hardware device.

The reasons that Krishnan does not disclose or suggest these features are discussed above. Onosaka and Elg do not remedy this failure of Krishnan and, notably, are not relied upon by the Final Office Action to describe or suggest these features that are not present in Krishnan.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 88, 105, and 120, and their respective dependent claims.

Claims 92, 98, 109, 115, 124 and 130

Claims 92, 98, 109, 115, 124 and 130, which depend from claims 88, 105 and 120, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnan in view of Onosaka and Elg, and further in view of Perlman.

With respect to these claims, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Perlman does not remedy the failure of Krishnan, Onosaka, and Elg to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claims and, notably, is not relied upon in the Final Office Action as describing the features missing from those references.

Claims 17-18, 45-46 and 73-74

Claims 17-18, 45-46 and 73-74, which depend from claims 1, 32 and 60, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnan in view of Onosaka and Perlman, and further in view of Coutts (6,311,165).

With respect to these claims, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Coutts does not remedy the failure of Krishnan, Onosaka, and Perlman to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claims and, notably, is

Applicant : Tuan Huu Pham et al.
Serial No. : 09/855,683
Filed : May 16, 2001
Page : 5 of 5

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-
136001 / Communications 38

not relied upon in the Final Office Action as describing the features missing from those references.

Claims 95-96, 112-113 and 127-128

Claims 95-96, 112-113 and 127-128, which depend from claims 88, 105 and 120, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnan in view of Onosaka and Elg, and further in view of Coutts.

With respect to these claims, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Coutts does not remedy the failure of Krishnan, Onosaka, and Elg to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claims and, notably, is not relied upon in the Final Office Action as describing the features missing from those references.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Please apply Petition for Extension of Time fee and any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/10/05

 37,640 \$05
W. Karl Renner
Reg. No. 41,265

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331